

and unable to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote No. 366. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1561, AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1561, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, cross references, punctuation, and indentation, and to make any other technical and conforming changes necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent all members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, on H.R. 1561, the bill just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for purpose of inquiring about the schedule from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The House will not be in session on Monday, June 12.

On Tuesday the House will meet at 12 o'clock p.m. to consider H.R. 1530, the fiscal year 1996 National Defense Authorization Act, subject to a rule. Members should be advised that recorded votes may take place beginning at 12 noon on Tuesday.

Wednesday and the balance of the next week the House will meet at 10 a.m. to complete consideration of H.R. 1530.

After completion of the defense measure we plan to take up the 1996 military construction appropriations bill. It is our hope to have Members on their way home to their families and

their districts by no later than 3 p.m. on Friday.

Mrs. KENNELLY. I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I am very concerned about what I understand the rule is going to be next week. Many of us were not able to offer very critical amendments this week to the foreign aid bill, and next week I had an amendment to the defense authorization bill that would bring the authorization bill down \$9.5 billion to the level the Pentagon asked for. It is my understanding that will not be made in order and I am very concerned about that, because I understood we were going to be allowed to at least debate fundamental differences and people of the committee, of which I am on the committee and a senior ranking member on the committee, would like to debate this fundamental deference.

So I am very concerned about whether next week we are just going to be here doing some pro forma pantomime rather than getting to the fundamental issues of the defense committee and these incredible markups that have happened.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Rules would like to speak to the rule on this bill. All I can say is that this is a very important piece of legislation. We are hoping to let many issues come to the floor under this legislation. There are a lot of Members who wanted amendments; unfortunately we could not accommodate all of them, but the chairman from the Committee on Rules can probably speak to this.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I say to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], I am not aware of any amendments being denied as yet. We are still in the process at this late hour of consulting with both the minority on the Committee on National Security and with the minority on the Committee on Rules as to what amendments will be made in order. The rule will be, as it has been in the past, a structured rule.

However, in our preliminary discussions with the minority on the two different committees, I believe they believe this is going to be a fair rule to all Members. Certainly we are going to try to take all of the major issues, significant issues, into consideration.

As soon as I finish this colloquy we will go up to the Committee on Rules and finish the consulting, and, hopefully, within the next hour or two pass a rule.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am then hoping what I am hearing is that you have not made a final decision on this. I know that the ranking member on the Committee on National Security has spoken to the Speaker, has spoken to all sorts of people. We feel this is one of the most fundamental issues there, and we thought people had come here to debate reasonable levels of expenditures. To deny our side the right to offer a very basic amendment that would bring the defense budget, the bloated defense budget, in my opinion, back down to where the Commander in Chief had it and the Pentagon had it I think would be absolutely outrageous, so I am glad to hear the Committee on Rules has not done that and that is a malicious rumor, and I certainly hope the gentleman from New York will not do that, or we are going to have to declare war or something.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to reinforce what the gentlewoman from Colorado said. It is inconceivable to me that the proposal on the budget made by the President would not come forward. I want to add, I have been disturbed, I had hoped we had had some progress on the rule, but I do not really believe that we have. In the first place, 3 days to do the defense bill is inadequate.

Now in fairness to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, given an inadequate amount of time there is not much he can do about that, but I would say to the leadership on the Republican side, 3 days to do the whole defense bill, which I assume includes debating the rule, which includes the general debate, and then amendments on this enormous amount of money which is in fact being increased, is clearly going to be inadequate, and we are seeing a restriction.

In particular I would like to urge and I would say to my friend, the chairman of Committee on Rules, if he is going to continue to do these rules that have a 6 hour and 8 hour, in the name of basic fairness, quorum calls should not come out of that time. If there is a debate about someone's words being taken down, it should not come out of that time. The problem now is that you give us the 6 hours and the clock does not stop. It is like a basketball game where the time outs and the fouls and everything else just run the clock, and then obviously allows people to game it, and even if they are not trying to game it, it is a problem.

So to them a rule with a hour limit if it does not exclude from that time things like quorum calls, fights over points of order, et cetera, we are clearly making a mockery of the process, and I would hope that that would not continue to happen.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I am sure, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules over there would attest to, that we do not intend to place a time limit certain. There will be 25 to 30 hours of debate on general debate and the amendment process, but there will be a assigned time for each amendment as we go along. We do not intend to have a time certain to cut off debate at all.

The points are well-taken.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield again to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that from the gentleman. I would hope that in the future if we do have a time certain there would be exclusions, you know, words being taken down or quorum calls, et cetera. The only thing I would like to say though as I am told that in accordance with past practice the minority on the Committee on Rules has been given a tentative list of amendments, and the gentlewoman from Colorado is conspicuous by her absence from that list. I am told that there is a tentative list out and the amendment that the gentlewoman from Colorado is proposing, the President's numbers, was not on that list. I hope that that was very tentative and soon to be corrected, because it does seem to us a major omission for that not to be there.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KENNELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. In response to the gentleman from Massachusetts' comments, and I do appreciate his comments, because it is a very important bill, I might warn Members that because it is such an important bill we could go late into the evenings the 3 days that we will be on this bill.

Mrs. KENNELLY. The gentleman is saying that there is a possibility that we will go late Tuesday and Wednesday and Thursday?

Mr. DELAY. It is highly likely that we will go late on Tuesday, Wednesday, and even Thursday.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield again to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I just want to hope that the House dining room has got the television on and heard what the gentleman said.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, quickly I would just like to ask one other thing. I notice on the schedule we got that morning hours on Tuesday have not been there. Is that just an oversight?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentlewoman will yield, that is just an oversight. We will have morning hours.

Mrs. KENNELLY. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW
TO TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1995

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, June 9, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 13, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1615

PROVIDING MEMBERSHIP OF THE
UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON
IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 962) to amend the Immigration Act of 1990 relating to the membership of the United States Commission on Immigration Reform.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. RIGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to ask the gentleman from Texas to explain the bill, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 962 adds former Representatives Hamilton Fish and Ron Mazzoli, by name, to the Commission on Immigration, chaired by former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan of Texas.

Hamilton Fish and Ron Mazzoli were both long-time members of the Committee on the Judiciary and of the Immigration Committee. Adding these two individuals to the commission would be a fitting tribute to their years of service in the Congress and to their work on immigration policy, and both have much to contribute to the commission itself.

Barbara Jordan, Chair of the Commission on Immigration Reform and Dr. Susan Forbes Martin, executive director of the commission, have expressed their support for this bill.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the minority is in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 962

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION.

Section 141(a)(1) of the Immigration Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-649) is amended—

(1) by striking "9 members to be appointed" and inserting "11 members"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

(F) Hamilton Fish, former Member of Congress and Ranking Minority Member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and Romano Mazzoli, former Member of Congress and Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Law, Immigration, and Refugees of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Texas: Page 1, line 6: Strike out "to be appointed".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAJO-HOPI RELOCATION HOUSING PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Resources be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 349) to reauthorize appropriations for the Navajo-Hopi Relocation Housing Program, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] to enable him to explain this piece of legislation.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the immediate consideration of S. 349, legislation which would reauthorize, for the upcoming 2 fiscal years, funding for that portion of the 1974 Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute Settlement Act, Public Law 93-531, which has come to be known as the Navajo-Hopi Relocation Housing Program.

This housing program provides payments to relocated Navajo and Hopi families who have been forced from lands partitioned pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 93-531.

As of the beginning of this year, Mr. Speaker, 2,518 families had been relocated. Another 746 eligible families are awaiting their benefits. Additional families may be determined to be eligible for relocation assistance in the months and years ahead.